

1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4

5 || ALFRED LAM, et al.,

6

Plaintiff(s),

No. C 10-4641 PJH

7

8 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.,

9

Defendant(s).

ORDER DENYING SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL

11 On April 28, 2014, plaintiffs in the above-captioned matter filed a proposed order
12 substituting themselves as counsel, in pro per. However, while the proposed order appears
13 to contain four signatures (presumably, one for each of the four plaintiffs), the proposed
14 order lists contact information for only one plaintiff, Alfredo Lam. Mr. Lam may represent
15 only himself, and may not represent any of the other three plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' request is
16 thus DENIED. If each plaintiff wishes to represent himself or herself in pro per, each
17 plaintiff must submit a separate substitution of attorney request, and must provide their own
18 contact information.

19 The court advises plaintiffs that all four of them must appear in person at the next
20 case management conference, scheduled for May 29, 2014 at 2:00pm.

21 The court also notes that Smith Patten is still listed as counsel of record for plaintiffs,
22 as no motion to withdraw as counsel has been filed. Until plaintiffs are properly substituted
23 in as counsel in pro per, Smith Patten is directed to serve a copy of this and any
24 subsequent orders on plaintiffs. See Civil Local Rule 11-5(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 | Dated: May 6, 2014

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge